Dep+ Ref



PATENT MAINTENANCE DIVISION

2006 APR 12 PM 4 37

Docket No.: 0941-0316P

(PATENT)

US PATENT. & TRADEMARK

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Ming-Dou Ker et al.

Application No.: 09/944,171

Confirmation No.: 9842

Filed: September 4, 2001

Art Unit: 2815

For: ESD PROTECTION CIRCUIT WITH VERY

Examiner: J. A. Fenty

LOW INPUT CAPACITANCE FOR HIGH-

FREQUENCY I/O PORTS

REQUEST FOR REFUND (IMPROPER CHARGE OF DEPOSIT ACCOUNT)

MS 16 Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 April 6, 2006

Sir:

I. REFUND REQUEST

This is a request for a refund with respect to the charge to Deposit Account <u>02-2448</u> shown on the statement for the month of January 2006 for the above-identified

application	patent		
A copy of the accompanies this request.	monthly statement in which	the error referred to	occurs,

KM/RFG/nip

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

Application No.: 09/944,171

Docket No.: 0941-0316P

II. FEES CHARGED FOR WHICH REFUND REQUESTED

	•		AMOUNT OF REFUND <u>REQUESTED</u>
[filing fee		
[search fee		
[examination fee		******
[surcharge for filing the basic filing on a date later than the filing date of the application (37 C.F.R. § 1.16(e))		
	and/or		
[surcharge for filing the oath or declaration on a date later than the filing date of the application (37 C.F.R. § 1.16(e))		
	extension of term		
	first month	·	-
	second month		
	third month		
	fourth month		
	excess claims		. ———
	issue fee		
	petition fee		
	· 3		VM/DEC/aia

lication l	No.: 09/944,171	Docket No.: 0941-0316F	
	patent maintenance fee		
	first maintenance fee		
	second maintenance fee	·	
	third maintenance fee		
	patent maintenance fee surcharge		
\boxtimes	Other: Appeal Brief Fee	500.00	
			
	TOTAL REFUND REQUESTED	\$500.00	

III. EXPLANATION OF WHY CONTESTED CHARGE IS IN ERROR

The Appeal Brief was originally filed March 1, 2004 and the <u>Appeal Brief Fee was paid</u> at that time. A copy of the postcard receipt for March 1, 2004 is enclosed showing receipt of the \$450 Appeal Brief fee (the amount of the Appeal Brief Fee at that time).

The Appeal Brief was lost in the USPTO and the undersigned had to petition to revive the case. The Examiner then said the original Appeal Brief was not in compliance with the rules (which had actually changed in the meantime). The undersigned refiled the Appeal Brief on January 4, 2006 with new appendices. The Appeal Brief fee was not paid because it had been paid on March 1, 2004. The USPTO incorrectly charged Deposit Account 02-2448 for the current Appeal Brief fee of \$500. Since the Appeal Brief fee was originally paid on March 1, 2004, it is requested that the \$500 be refunded to the undersigned.

Application No.: 09/944,171



Docket No.: 0941-0316P

IV. MANNER OF REFUND

Please make refund by crediting Account No. 02-2448.

We respectfully request that the attached copy of this letter be returned to us with an indication that the credit has been processed.

Dated: April 6, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

M

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Attachment(s): Copy of Postcard Receipt of March 1, 2004

	Papers Filed herewith on: 3-1-04 DOCKET NO.: OPYI-036P ATTY:: LMIRES APPLICANT(S): Miros-Dou KER et all APPLN. NO: OPIGGUNITI FILED: QIUIOI PAT NO.: New Application with Transmittal Letter	19
THE REPORT OF THE PROPERTY OF	Utility Design CIP PCT Provisional Filing Under 37 CFR 1.53(b) CONT Provisional Filing Under 37 CFR 1.114(RCE) Specification Consisting of:	100 COLI 100 CP
	Receipt is hereby acknowledged of the papers filed as indicated in connection with the above identified case. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Due Date: 3///o²/ Handcarry:	

PATENT 0941-0316P

IN RE APPLICATION OF

BEFORE THE BOARD OF APPEALS

Ming-Dou KER et al.

Appeal No.:

APPL. NO.:

09/944,171

GROUP:

2815

FILED:

September 4, 2001

EXAMINER: Jesse A. Fenty

CONF.:

9842

FOR:

ESD PROTECTION CIRCUIT WITH VERY LOW INPUT CAPACITANCE FOR HIGH-FREQUENCY I/O PORTS

APPEAL BRIEF ON BEHALF **OF APPELLANTS:** MING-DOU KER ET AL.

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 January 4, 2006

Sir:

This is the Appellants' brief in response to a Final Rejection mailed July 29, 2003 finally rejecting claims 1-17. A copy of the claims appealed are attached as an Appendix. The fee of \$330.00 for filing a brief in support of an appeal under 37 C.F. R. § 1.17(f) is submitted herewith.

1. **REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The present application is assigned to Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Co., Ltd. as recorded on September 4, 2001 at Reel 102142, Frames 0370 and 0371. No further assignments of this application have been made.

11. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences for this application.

01/06/2006 HALI11

09944171 00000043 022448

01 FC:1402

500.00 DA

Adjustment date: 05/01/2006 SDIRETA1 01/06/2006 HALI11 00000043 022448 09944171 01 FC:1402 500.00 CR

This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning Operations and is not part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

□ BLACK BORDERS
/ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
□ other:

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.